DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 267 063 SP 027 385

AUTHOR Williams, David D., Comp.
TITLE Improving Education through a Public School-University Partnership. Papers Presented at a Symposium of the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-19, 1986).
PUB DATE 17 Apr 86
NOTE 48p.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Colleges; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Public Schools; Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This document consists of seven papers about educational improvement resulting from partnerships between public schools and universities. David Williams' paper discusses the Brigham Young University (Utah) Public School Project to answer the question: "Can a Comprehensive Public School-University Partnership Meaningfully Contribute to the Solution of Educational Problems?" Del Wasden describes the work of a task force in a partnership in "The Partnership: Department Chairmen View." Bonnie Dahl writes from a personal viewpoint in "A Principal's Perspective: Lessons Learned from a Partnership Experience." "A University Faculty Member's Perspective: Lesson Learned from a Partnership Experience" is presented by Lillian Heil. "The Partnership Concept from the Perspective of an Educator in the Public Schools" is presented by Joyce Nelson. "Lessons Learned from the Partnership Experience--A Superintendent's Perspective" is presented by Clark Cox. Lastly, Ralph Smith makes a case for long-term commitment to partnership in "Public School--University Partnership: Observations of a Dean." (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED267063

Improving Education Through a Public School- University Partnership

Organized by David D. Williams
Brigham Young University

A collection of papers for a symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 17, 1986, San Francisco, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP027385

Introduction to the Research Question:
Can a comprehensive public school-university partnership meaningfully contribute to the solution of educational problems?

David Williams
Brigham Young University

Literature Overview

Although universities depend on schools to place their student teachers, schools depend on universities to provide newly prepared educators, and efforts have been made over the years to improve the quality of cooperation between these institutions, true unity has been absent. The public schools and the universities have proceeded with schooling quite independently of one another within boundaries intentionally drawn by both institutions. Critics of the partnership notion (Barth, 1984; Schlechty, 1985) identify a variety of barriers which may have prevented (and they believe will continue to prevent) successful cooperation between schools and universities.

However, in response to the recent barrage of criticism of schools and the preparation of teachers and other educators, several educators (e.g., Dansenberger and Usdan, 1984; Goodlad, 1984; Martin and Wood, 1984; Tyler, 1983) have realized that integral, significant improvement of schooling will require a team effort. Seeley(1984) summarized the need for more serious collaboration between schools and universities thusly: "The partnership model enables us to talk constructively about how we have failed in the past and how we can work together in the future. There is no need

to waste time and energy assigning blame. We all share responsibility for maintaining an approach that hasn't worked adequately and we can all work together to fashion a new collaborative approach that has a better chance to succeed." (page 386)

Goodlad (1985, 1986), Sizer (1984) and others(e.g., the University of Washington at Seattle, the Exxon Education Foundation) perceive the need for increased and qualitatively better cooperation between schools and univerities to be so critical and of such high potential that they are funding and forming a variety of collaborative organizations and even a network of such partnerships.

The term "partnership" has been used with increasing frequency during the last few years to represent a wide variety of efforts to reform educational practice. But a review of the literature reveals the fact that very few of these consortia are intended to encourage comprehensive renewal of college programs and personnel as well as those of the schools in a truly symbiotic relationship. Instead, the focus is generally on some change needed in the schools with the university personnel doing their part (often along with other institutions in the community) to help.

A common partnership focus is the preparation and inservice of teachers. The entire Winter 1985-86 issue of Action in Teacher Education reviews several such efforts and lessons learned from experiences in collaboration. Similar articles appear in a variety of journals (e.g., Wiles and Branch, 1979; Trueblood and Flanagan, 1984; several articles in the November-December 1984 issue of the Journal of Teacher Education).

Another type of partnership involves cooperation between the schools and a variety of other institutions, including the university to improve the educational experiences of students while they are going to school. These include many different forms of "adopt-a-school" efforts by businesses and the involvement of families with teachers and students in jointly planned learning activities. Some fairly widely circulated documents have encourged these efforts (Seeley, 1981; the entire issue of The Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1984).

A related form of collaboration focuses on articulation. Maeroff (1983), Shrive (1984), and several authors in the January-February 1982 issue of Change discuss the need for universities to help schools prepare students better so they will be ready for college. Several proposals are made for modifying the grade level division between high schools and universities.

Some partnerships have formed to facilitate the collaborative conduct of research in ways and settings which will enhance the likelihood of inquiry having impact on practice (Baker, 1984; Eisner, 1984; Norris, Starrfield, and Hartwell, 1984; and several articles in the April 1985 issue of the Journal of Educational Thought).

Others are organized to solve specific problems (again, nearly always in the public schools, not in the universities) and develop associated programs (Carpenter and Mahlios; Hagberg and Walker, 1981; Hunt, McMillan, and Worth, 1978; Shrive, 1984).

But, as illustrated by Wilbur (1985) and Gilman (1985-1986), very few comprehensive partnerships have evolved to address all issues that may be relevant to educational reform in both higher

education and the public schools. This symposium was organized to present and analyze one such reform effort.

The BYU-Public School Partnership

Through a variety of circumstances, a consortium involving Brigham Young University and five public school districts was formed in April 1984. A brief overview of historical relationships among these participating institutions, the national and local conditions leading to the cooperative alliance, the nature of the Partnership itself, a few of its accomplishments and some of its challenges provide a context for discussing potential research to be done on and through partnershipping.

Historical relationships. The relationships between the five participating school districts and Brigham Young University have been typical of most schools and universities in the United States--almost mutually exclusive. The five districts represent approximately one-third (100,000+) of the rapidly growing total student enrollment in Utah and include one urban, three suburban and one rural districts. The districts are contiguous and adjoin the private university. BYU is the largest teacher education institution in Utah, preparing over one-half of all teachers graduated in Utah.

Inspite of an emphasis on preparation of school professionals, BYU has followed the convention of using the schools as settings for training their students without seriously cooperating with teachers and school administrators to define those experiences jointly so the mutual benefits could be more effectively reached. Also, except for a

few exceptions, instead of joining the BYU faculty in joint research ventures, the schools have set policies which essentially prevent university faculty and students from overwhelming the schooling process with their requests to install student teachers and interns in buildings and to do research "on the schools and the students in them."

However, the relationships have not been antagonistic, perhaps because the BYU faculty have focused more on preparation of educators than on research; but neither have they been especially beneficial to the schools. These five districts and university have essentially co-existed for many years; but recent developments in conditions have led to a change in the status quo.

National and local conditions. Since 1982, national, state and local public attention has focused heavily on public education and the preparation of educators. National reports from a variety of sources (e.g., Adler, 1982; Carnegie Foundation, n.d.; Goodlad, 1984; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Sizer, 1983; Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983; 20th Century Fund Task Force, 1983; Wirtz and LaPointe, 1982) have warned public school personnel and schools of education which prepare educators that they need to improve the system and the quality of education.

In Utah, which has one of the fastest growing public school student populations in the country (enrollments growing by 4-6% per year), the same public pressure has been mounting. The following recommendations from the Utah Education Reform Steering Committee's November 1983 report (Education in Utah: A Call to

Action) are both representative and indicative of this public pressure. From page 17--

> The board of Regents, the State Board of Education, colleges and schools of education, and academic departments should reform their methods, procedures, and curriculum for educating teachers and administrators. Reforms should include increased cooperation and coordination with school districts in student teaching and in evaluation of prospective teachers. That cooperative relationship should extend to support the professional development of newly employed teachers. The academic preparation of teachers should be substantially improved, especially in subjects they will teach. Other college and university departments should be more active partners with the departments of education in the preparation of teachers. Practice teaching should be given heavier emphasis.

Locally, the pressure for improvement from national and state sources was reinforced by several well attended public meetings, and increased attention in the news. The central BYU administration specifically charged the College of Education to serve the public schools' interests more appropriately through research and the preparation of educators. Although BYU prepares more Utah educators than any other institution in the state, there was pressure to improve the quality of that preparation.

In response, the Dean of the College of Education initiated dialogue with the superintendents of some of the local school districts to discuss possible ways to respond to the many calls for

reform. He also arranged to have Dr. John Goodlad fill a visiting scholars' chair at BYU to encourage the faculty and public school representatives to respond to the public outcry for change.

An outside catalyst. John Goodlad and his associates (1984) had recently published the findings of a series of studies of schooling in A Place Called School when he came to BYU as a visiting scholar. He met with BYU faculty in a variety of settings to discuss the status of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the college and requests from the central administration to increase scholarly productivity while focusing on ways to improve the public schools. He met with representatives of the public schools to discuss the needs for reform there and to ascertain some of their concerns about working with the BYU College of Education.

After several such discussions, Goodlad identified a set of common interests shared by the university and public schools which might serve as a basis for cooperation. In April 1984, he met jointly with the superintendents of the school districts and the deans of the college to outline those common interests and to propose a means of organizing to address these concerns together. As a result, the BYU-Public School Partnership was formed.

The Partnership. At that same meeting a very simple organization was agreed upon which has continued to function these two years. First, there was to be a Governing Board consisting of the Superintendents and Dean who would meet monthly to identify and determine how to address common interests.

Second, others in the schools and university would contribute their perspectives by participating on task forces consisting of

faculty, teachers, and administrators from the member institutions assigned to work on specific challenges as requested via "charges" issued by the Governing Board. Projects could be initiated by faculty and administrators other than those on the Governing Board as well; but before receiving official endorsement of the Partnership, these activities would need the approval of the Board.

Third, an executive secretary was appointed to coordinate all the activities of these groups and serve other functions as they become defined. Some of these duties included representing the Partnership to outside agencies, facilitating communication within the Partnership as well as with other interested parties, encouraging research, evaluation, and development projects, seeking funding, and documenting the evolution of the Partnership. The author has served as executive secretary for the past two years.

The five common interests of the cooperating institutions were stated as objectives or goals:

1)Improve educator preparation and inservice programs,

2)Develop ways to make educational practice more congruent with what is known about learners, the learning process and teaching effectiveness,

3)Explore the use of key schools,

4)Develop strategies for attracting highly capable students into the education profession, and

5)Coordinate research activities and the evaluation of programs in the member institutions so common interests are properly addressed.

During the first meeting of the Governing Board in April, 1984, one of the Superintendents was elected to chair the Board and two task forces were initiated to begin addressing ways to improve the preparation of principals and the preparation of teachers. Discussion about funding, formal organization, yearly goals, operating procedures, and so on was postponed. The Board was anxious to get on with the common interests and wasted no time formalizing the organization.

Accomplishments. Although the longterm success of the Partnership in terms of its goals (the achievement of the common interests) remains to be seen, some progress has been made in two years. Perhaps too obvious to mention, yet, essential to the concept is the fact that the original institutions are all still interested in continuing the collaboration. The Governing Board has continued to meet almost every month and function in spite of the transfer of one of the superintendents who served as the first chair and other administrative pressures. The college continues to provide one of its faculty to serve as the executive secretary as well as making other resources available. The idea is still very much alive.

Several task forces (administrator preparation, teacher preparation, gifted and talented, guidance and counseling, special education, foreign language diversification, and just recently a task force on research and evaluation consisting of the research directors from each of the districts and a BYU faculty member) have been formed and continue to function. Each institution provides representatives to these task forces who receive no extra

compensation for their time or travel (although the districts have provided substitute teachers for teacher representatives).

Research, evaluation, and program development projects are emerging from these task forces. For example, a new principals' preparation program designed by the administrative task force in cooperation with BYU's department of educational leadership is being piloted this coming academic year. Students were selected from among applicants from the five districts through a process which involved mentor principals from all the districts cooperating with BYU faculty. Students will spend a majority of their time in the schools with these mentor principals during the coming year.

Other task force products include 1) a process for forming key or partner schools in which BYU faculty will work with teachers to experiment with and develop curriculum and instructional innovations, 2) organization by the research group of a series of research and evaluation projects in areas of common interest for which the College is providing graduate interns to help district research directors, and 3) Summer programs for gifted and talented students in the languages, dance, drama and art of foreign cultures and in science, outdoor studies, museum projects and law.

Challenges. Of course, the participants in the Partnership have encountered a variety of challenges to their efforts to cooperate and make changes in the processes of education, the preparation of educators, and the conduct of research and evaluation of education. Several of these challenges, as well as the accomplishments will be discussed by the other participants in this symposium. However, some of them are outlined briefly here. Perhaps the most prevalent

challenge from the beginning of the Partnership has been the need to develop confidence in all participants that others were truly dedicated and committed to the idea. Although they continue to express enthusiasm and even excitement over the accomplishments of the various task forces, the members of the Governing Board are at times hesitant and cautious as they participate in a collaborative effort of which is there is little known.

Related to this concern is the challenge of developing a sense of collegiality among the members of the Partnership. Although participants on task forces have been cooperating quite well, it is obvious that school teachers and university faculty live in very different worlds and working as colleagues involves more patience and understanding of one another than anyone anticipated. The Dean and the Superintendents work well as peers; but many of the teachers and principals working with the university faculty took their degrees under these same persons and struggle to feel like true colleagues. A considerable amount of time has been spent by the members of task forces developing the sense of mutual trust and respect associated with collegial relationships. Much more will be spent.

Another challenge the Governing Board faces is deciding how much and what responsibilities to delegate to others. So far, there has been a general feeling of anxiety about people doing things in the name of the Partnership without review and approval of the Board. Now, after two years, the Board has established a research group to screen research proposals and to propose evaluation of efforts. The Board has tended to want to review all proposals, but too much is

going on for them to continue do so. Can the Board delegate? How and to whom should they delegate what responsibilities?

Unlike several other partnerships that are forming, Partnership members have not yet seen the need to discuss the matter of financial support for the Partnership. A small grant from the Utah State of Office of Education has provided sufficient support for initial efforts. The school districts have employed substitute teachers to replace school representatives who participate on task forces. And the university has provided faculty and graduate student time to support the Partnership. At some point, however, the Board members anticipate they will have to address the matter of financing the many other activities that are developing.

Although the informal organization has functioned well thus far, the Governing Board has begun to discuss the need for more formal policies and job descriptions. For example, rather than assign the executive secretary to do whatever comes up, perhaps that position should have specific responsibilities which are clearly identified and publically announced. Likewise, policies on rights of affiliation and responsibilities of partners could be stated more explicitly. These issues have not demanded decisions yet; but as the Partnership matures and tackles more and more problems, good answers to these and other concerns will be needed.

A continual problem is lack of communication. Even after two years, many people in the schools and university know very little about the Partnership and what they can do with it to help them improve. Brochures and newsletters may serve this function; but

more detailed and active ways to inform and involve members of the participating organizations need to be explored.

The question of who to involve in the Partnership is also a concern. Some possibilites include other districts, the local technical college, local businesses, and representatives of the public. At issue is the question of whether to stay small until the Partnership is well established or to get others involved while we are struggling with some of the fundamental problems of starting.

Determining how to best initiate Partnership activities is another challenge. Balancing a "trickle down" of ideas from the Governing Board with the "bubble up" of proposals from the faculty in the schools and university is the concern. So far many of the issues have originated with the college representatives before they received consideration, modification and sponsorship of the Board. It is not clear that this process is the best.

Finally, there is the issue of how to best evaluate progress. Very little thought has been given so far to assessing how the Partnership generally as well as the individual programs and projects sponsored by the Partnership (like the administrative program) are doing.

Research Ideas

Emerging from the experiences of the BYU-Public School Partnership are a variety of research issues. Some of these are questions about the partnership concept itself and others are problems faced by education generally which might be profitably addressed through the Partnership.

Questions regarding the partnership phenomenon itself. Some of the questions regarding partnerships that have emerged from our experiences are listed briefly here. Through naturalistic and historical analyses, we hope to address these issues as the Partnership evolves. Likewise, through participation in a national Network of partnerships recently organized by John Goodlad, we plan to collaborate with others who are seeking answers to these same questions.

1. How and why do partnerships form and begin operation? How do operations change over time and why?
2. What are the various participating organizations' needs and their members' motives for joining forces in this way and continuing to cooperate?
3. How do relationships among participants (particularly those from the university with those from the schools) develop and impact on the participants, their home organizations, and the goals (formal and unstated) of the participating institutions as well as the consortium?
4. What are the different roles played by each of the participants? How do university personnels' teaching, scholarship and service roles change? How do school personnels' teaching and scholarship roles change?
5. How are policies made and enacted?
6. What are the most likely outcomes associated with the Partnership to be for the university programs and faculty and for the schools' personnel and students?
7. Does participation in a partnership encourage faculty and school reforms? If so, how and what kinds? If not, why?

8. What are the communication patterns within the Partnership and what are the implications for education and learning generally?

9. What role does the national Network of partnerships to which this Partnership belongs play? What is the nature of that form of collaboration? Do the university staff dominate in the Network or are schools and universities equally represented?

10. What problems are encountered in the evolution of a partnership and how are they addressed?

11. What is going on in other partnerships and what does the literature contribute to our understanding of partnerships generally?

12. How do partners cooperate in a "key" school arrangement and what are the implications of that idea for the improvement of education and the utilization of research results by practitioners?

Ideas for research on education using the Partnership.

In addition to these questions on the partnership concept, some of the general educational issues we are addressing in the BYU-Public School Partnership are listed below.

1. How should school principals be selected and prepared to most effectively enhance student learning?

2. How should the resources of the entire university and the schools be coordinated to most effectively select and prepare teachers to enhance student learning?

3. What is the role of student teaching and how can it be done more appropriately?

4. What is the effect of year-round schooling on student learning and on other outcomes?

5. Which of several career ladder programs are most effective given a variety of conditions and different definitions of effectiveness?

6. How can gifted and talented students best be served without increasing the proportion of tax dollars appropriated for their programs?

7. How can schools begin to diversify the foreign languages they offer given the interests of the public and the lack of prepared teachers in such languages as Japanese, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian?

8. What are the best roles for school guidance and counseling specialists and how can they be appropriately prepared for those roles?

9. How can colleges of education best prepare special education teachers given the diversity of special education needs? What are those needs?

10. What is known about teaching children to think and how should this information be built into the curriculum and into teacher preparation and inservice?

11. What is known about effective teaching and how should this information be built into the curriculum and into teacher preparation and inservice?

12. What is known about personnel evaluation, how can it be done more appropriately, and how can practical changes in the processes used in schools be made?

Conclusion

It should be clear from this overview that the BYU-Public School Partnership has been born and is growing through its infancy

and well into its toddler phase. The focus has been on getting things done that will improve education; but the partners recognize they may need to pay more attention to maintenance and development of the mechanism as well. Besides, understanding how a group of institutions with a small set of common interests can function in a collaborative effort is nearly as interesting as the work for change that nominally justifies the partnership.

References

Action in Teacher Education, 7 (4), Winter, 1985-86.

Adler, M. J. (1982). Paideia Proposal. New York: McMillan.

Baker, E. L. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? Yes! Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (7), March, 453-455.

Barth, R. S. (1984). Can we make a match of schools and universities? Education Week, November 28, 24, 16.

Carnegie Foundation. (n. d.). High School-- a report on secondary education in America. Scranton: Keystone Industrial Park.

Carpenter, R. L. and Mahlios, M. C. (1982). Functional relationships between universities and public schools. Education, 102 (4), Summer, 339-342.

Change. (1982). January-February

Dansenberger, J. and Usdan, M. D. (1984). Building partnerships: the Atlanta experience. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (6), February, 393-396.

Eisner, E. W. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (7), March, 447-452.

Gilman, F. (1985-1986). Selected annotated bibliography. Action in Teacher Education, 7 (4), Winter, 67-74.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodlad, J. I. (1985). Reconstructing schooling and the education of educators. Presentation at the Summer Conference of the Chief State School Officers, Wisconsin.

Goodlad, J.I. (1986). Elements of a vital teacher education program. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, Illinois. February 28.

Hagberg, H. and Walker, D. (1981). Working it out together: The work/study team is the core of a school-university collaboration benefitting everyone involved. Educational Leadership, 38 (7), April, 563-565.

Hunt, M. H., McMillan, C. B., and Worth, K. L. (1978). University-school collaboration in Boston. Integrated Education, 16 (92), March-April, 21-23.

Journal of Educational Thought. (1985). 19 (1), April.

Journal of Teacher Education. (1984). 35 (6), November-December.

Maeroff, G. I. (1983). School and college: Partnerships in education. Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation.

Martin, R. E. Jr. and Wood, G. H. (1984). Early field experiences: unification of cooperating teachers' and teacher education students' diverse perspectives. An unpublished paper presented a the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisianna.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Norris, C. A., Starrfield, S. L., and Hartwell, L. K. (1984). Old adversaries united: Benefits of collaborative research. NASSP Bulletin, 68 (471), April, 143-147.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1984). 65 (6), February.

Seeley, D. S. (1981). Education through partnership: Mediating structures and education. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.

Seeley, D. S. (1984). Educational partnership and the dilemmas of school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 65 (6), February, 383-388.

Schlechty, P. C. (1985). Reconstructing the teaching occupation: a proposal. Unpublished manuscript.

Shrive, J. (1984). School and university partnerships: meeting common needs. Improving College and University Teaching, 32 (3), Summer, 119-122.

Sizer, T. (1984). High school reform and the reform of teacher education. Ninth annual DeGarmo Lecture, University of Minnesota.

Sizer, T. (1983). Horace's compromise: A dilemma of the American high schools. Palo Alto, Calif.: Houghton-Mifflin.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). Action for Excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools. Denver, Colo.: Education Commission.

Trueblood, C. R. and Flanagan, K. R. (1983-84). A collaborative effort for staff development. Rural Educator, 5 (2), 27-31.

20th Century Fund Task Force. (1983). Making the grade. New York: 20th Century Fund.

Tyler, R. W. (1983). Studies of schooling: a place called school. Phi Delta Kappan, 64 (7), March, 462-464.

Utah Education Reform Steering Committee. (1983). Education in Utah: A call to action. Salt Lake City, Utah: State of Utah.

Wilbur, F. P. School-college partnership: Building effective models for collaboration. Journal of College Admissions, 108, Summer, 12-14.

Wiles, M. M. and Branch, J. (1979). University-public school collaboration models in teacher education. Educational Forum, 44 (1), 35-43.

Wirtz and LaPointe. (1982). Measuring the quality of education. Washington: National Institute for Work and Learning.

Del Wasden
March 17, 1986

THE PARTNERSHIP: DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN VIEW

On June 23, 1986, fifteen educators, mostly classroom teachers, will begin a new Principal's Preparation Program on our campus. No group of master's students have ever been so closely screened and carefully selected as these. Their superintendent has evaluated their leadership potential and underwritten their full year program at half salary. Two days of testing and observation in large and small group processes by University faculty and selected mentor principals who will supervise an intensive full time internship over the course of three semesters were held. The pilot group represents the most able, competent and academically qualified student contingent ever admitted to our master's program. They will enter as a cohort group, participate in skill and knowledge assessments and follow a prescribed program of seminars on campus and in the field, problem episodes real and simulated and short block foundation course instruction to be built upon during the school year. The University has provided a paid internship which will cover tuition, books and fees and other credits.

The partnership program is the result of two and one half years of deliberate and difficult work by a task force of principals, professors and students under the direction of the board of governors.

When the task force for the improvement of administrative training was appointed, all who served must have privately wondered if such a union of necessity could be made to work. Over the past decade, an increasing professional distance has separated university and public school personnel. Communication has been limited to only that required for business purposes. University graduate programs in educational administration need much improvement. The programs are primarily about educational administration rather than performing in educational administration. The programs do not give adequate attention to the fact that administration is essentially a matter of doing what must be done when it must be done in the most effective and efficient way. In the first months of the task force meetings, members became well acquainted with the nature of our focus on program rather than personalities. From the principal's perspective, the University had become more of a barrier than a bridge. While the University research and resources might have been used to help solve problems in the field, the University people continued their emphasis on certification and degree programs periodically randomizing the rules just to keep things interesting. From the University perspective, school administrators had lost contact with 'the source', had turned inward to satisfy unmet needs and thereby lost a valuable ally. No one ever wins a rigor v. relevance debate, but when the dialogue about relationships was over, most agreed that it was an important exercise to have the opportunity to be heard and in turn to listen to others. The process the task force was to go through would determine in a large measure, how successful the mission to prepare better principals would be.

After months of trust building through open dialogue and sharing we entered a transition phase from "us and them" to "we." The health of our group could have been measured on any given day by plotting the frequency of the use of the pronoun 'we'. It signifies investment, ownership and commitment and in a real sense is an attitude or a spirit rather than a stratagem or a method. "We" is an inclusive, integrative symbol that speaks volumes about relationships. It precedes the most important development in a group, the emergence of an ethos.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The group investigated views about administrative training through a priority matrix and once again broad and deep differences were noted. It was obvious early on that an administrative practicum would play an increasing role in training administrators largely because of the dissatisfaction with current student intern arrangements and the need for a stronger interface with the school and its personnel.

As we attempted to sort all the data we had gathered, we adopted a systems approach. The systems view of organizations holds that an organization is a living organism which grows and develops in response to its needs within the environment. Systems are integrated wholes whose properties cannot be reduced to those of smaller units and that tend to view the world in terms of relationships and integration, rather than isolation. A system is intrinsically dynamic rather than rigid, flexible yet stable. Systems thinking focuses on process, the form follows the process and function. The functioning of the system is guided by information flow known as feedback loops and these loops provide for adaptive behavior on the part of the organization.

Adopting this view allowed the task force to avoid the pitfall of focusing upon organizational structure before the nature of the organization and the functions were identified. The group came to see themselves as a dynamic whole with myriads of interrelationships rather than isolates representing one fixed position or another. The adopted process of investigating function and strengthening relationships within the task force gave credibility to the process itself. An additional benefit was the understanding that decision responses were not permanent and change and adaptability were inevitable, in fact essential to the success of the organization.

The systems approach allowed the Department faculty to view the activities of the task force with far less suspicion and anxiety. Feedback loops provided for the free flow of information and made possible required adaptations. Being able to see ourselves as an educational whole under the partnership has been essential to the development and maturity of the task force. A fact often overlooked by such special focus groups is the enormous amount of time required for its own metamorphosis. In effect it becomes a tandem objective; to get the group where it must be in order to accomplish the charge given to it and then to achieve the mission. Confusion or uncertainty about the process the group must engage in for its own growth and maturity is magnified as it attempts to address the mission objectives.

Each time our task force met there was disclosure to the department faculty with feedback from the faculty to the task force. Faculty members who served on the task force were in a position to discuss and clarify task force activity. Feedback to department faculty was continuous, accurate and detailed. Informal reports were not sufficient to satisfy faculty inquiry. When the subject is 'turf' detailed information is essential. Too much information is preferred over too little.

After process and function were addressed, the task force began to consider various structures such as committees, and sub groups for investigation of principal training programs. In almost every case, broad representation on committees was more important than like interests . The special interest problem was averted largely because the task force chose to avoid structures which would encourage such interest oriented group formation.

There were difficult times, largely precipitated by occasional defensive postures or lapses in 'we thinking' relative to our group task. The sage's advice that 'if you can't stand to hear the answer, don't ask the question' visited the task force many times.

After eighteen months of work, the task force report recommended a program that was to direct prospective principals towards the acquisition of competence in seven areas with attendant related skills. The mission of the program is: to prepare educational leaders who have as their central focus pupil development. This mission expresses the belief that leadership is far broader than any view we have previously held about the principalship. If our partnership is to be successful this shared mission must find its expression in more appropriate and substantial training programs.

Interest and commitment to the partnership is strong and has brought a renewal of purpose to those who have participated. For the first time in many years we believe the paths of major educational focus have converged. The result may well be the power to improve training programs in education in years to come.

"A Principal's Perspecitve: Lessons learned
from a partnership experience."

By Bonnie Dahl

My first recollection of the Administrator Preparation Task Force goes back to a phone call from the Superintendent, and in a district as large as ours, with 53 schools and 60,000 students, a phone call from the superintendent is a rare occurrence. Of course I answered that call with a bit of fear and trepidation, imagining all the potential disasters that might have precipated the call.

The superintendent was very cordial and asked me if I would like to represent the 43 elementary schools in our district and serve on a partnership task force with B.Y.U. He mentioned something about re-designing the Education Administration Program, gave me a time, date and place for the meeting and we said good-bye.

As I hung up, I remember feeling very flattered at being asked to serve on such an important task force, but at the same time, I felt overwhelmed with the overload of work stacked on my desk, and I wondered just how much time the task force would take.

At our first meeting, Dean Smith gave us a brief overview of the goals of the task force and then left the room. I looked around at the unfamiliar faces of the principals and B.Y.U. Faculty members and wondered how we would ever accomplish such an important task, and I felt even more stress when I was elected co-chairperson of the committee.

We were given a 45 page document that had been prepared by a previous committee. It contained their descriptions of the competencies necessary for a successful principal. We decided to take the document home, read it and meet again in a few weeks to discuss the document and its place in our partnership program.

With much eagerness and anticipation, I found a quiet place in my home and sat down to read the document. After reading the first ten pages of list after list of the competencies required of the successful principal, I began to feel very discouraged to think so much could be required of any human being. I then began to feel I was probably not even qualified to be a principal, let alone a member of the task force to design a program to train effective principals.

I drove to the next meeting feeling discouraged and hopeless. When we met and discussed the document, I immediately felt better upon learning that all principals on the task force had the same overwhelmed feelings. Most task force members felt the document was far too complicated and needed to be condensed into a workable form.

We formed committees and assigned them the task of condensing different sections of the document. At our next meeting, things really became complicated. Everyone had different ideas as to the most basic competencies required of a successful principal. The more we tried to condense the document, the more stubborn many of the individuals became. Some of the principals used the time to air personal gripes regarding their overload of work and restrictions placed on them by their districts. Most principals were also very skeptical concerning the concept that a university would really listen to their ideas and make changes based upon them. Many principals felt this was probably an exercise in futility. Some B.Y.U. staff members became very protective of their program and talked at length on the reasons why certain elements of the doucment should be retained. One entire meeting was wasted while two B.Y.U. faculty members argued over the appropriate label for a particular curriculum concept. The rest of the B.Y.U. faculty seemed embarrassed and the principals felt their entire morning away from their schools had been wasted arguing over an insignificant issue. The principals could see the outcome of their argument would never matter to the final mission of the task force. Of course, now I am able to look back on this experience and realize why the professors could not let go of their ideas. They belonged to them,, they were taught these concepts and they were not about to surrender their turf without a fight.

As we left this meeting, a principal commented to me on the wasted morning. He said he could not afford to spend so much time awary from his building and felt we would never be able to make real changes in the B.Y.U. program. This principal did not attend the next meeting.

In our next few meetings, it became nearly impossible to sort out or come to consensus on important competencies. In fact, it became nearly unbearable and entire meetings were held with little apparent progress being made. A few of the principals began to feel the situation was hopeless and the attendance at meetings started to drop off. The co-chairpersons had to ask the superintendents to remind the principals to attend the meetings or assign replacements.

One B.Y.U. faculty member confided in me that his department really should not have much input in the program and he felt this task force had done all it could and should be abolished. Several principals expressed similar feelings. They could see little progress and felt they needed to spend their time at their schools. I never wanted to give up, but I was grateful for the 45 minute drive back to my school because it gave me a chance to clear my head after our mental sparring at the meetings.

We began to feel pressured to come up with some type of plan because Dr. Goodlad was flying in to review our work. In an attempt to reach agreement, we decided to work on all the things that could cause a principal to fail. We brainstormed these ideas and ranked them in order of importance.

We managed to pull our fragmented ideas together and Dr. Goodlad reviewed them. He did not give them rave reviews and suggested a review of the literature. The minutes of the meeting where Dr. Goodlad reviewed our plans were sent to all B.Y.U. faculty members and all principals. The minutes stated Dr. Goodlad felt our task force had done its job and should be abolished. I had attended the meeting and had heard Dr. Goodlad's suggestions of reviewing the literature. I called all of the principals and asked them if they had read their minutes. They were also very surprised to read that our task force was abolished. I called the secretary who had typed the minutes and she said a B.Y.U. faculty member had interpreted Dr. Goodlad's thoughts to mean the task force had finished its job and another task force should be formed.

I called Dean Smith and told him what had happened. He was very understanding and supportive and said our task force was to remain and finish the job.

We called another meeting and discussed the inaccurate minutes. We were unanimous in deciding to stay together as a task force. The fact that our task force was nearly abolished seemed to help us form a group loyalty. We decided to stay together and work to form a successful plan.

We also hired a graduate student to pull the current research together and then studied the results. This helped us focus on some important competencies mentioned in the latest research. We then started to talk of "how" to form an effective partnership between the schools and the University, we really made good progress. We discussed the concept of the mentor principals (mentor principals train the intern principals) and their roles in the field and of being active participants in the ongoing development of curriculum for the new Administrative Masters Degree Program at B.Y.U.

When Dr. Goodlad reviewed our final plan, it was very gratifying to find he liked our ideas and plans and felt they would work. Our many efforts and trials had finally paid off and it felt good!

As a principal, it has been personally satisfying to be on the partnership task force. Prior to my task force membership, my only experience with universities had been as a student. The university, as an institution, had always seemed to be an immovable object. One always needed to find ways to survive the rules and roadblocks set out by the university. The chance to really be heard by the B.Y.U. faculty was a very rewarding experience. It felt good to think principals could take an important part in forming the new educational administration program at B.Y.U. When sharing our task force goals with my collegues, I find they are very enthusiastic over the concept. They feel relief over the chance to be heard and appreciated for their role in the educational scene; however, they are also very skeptical and feel real or lasting changes may not be made. As a member of the task force, I feel a real commitment and responsibility to make our plan work. I know this will take continued time and effort on my part, but

I am willing to keep participating because I believe so much in the positive influence of the effective principal on the education of children. Because I believe in this, I am proud to take part in B.Y.U.'s admirable efforts to improve the training program to help individuals become the best possible administrators. I am hopeful our plan will be successful because the task force is still in place and some of the mentor principals are also on the task force. This will make it possible for the mentor principals to make certain real changes are occurring and to provide continuous feedback to the B.Y.U. staff and the task force.

A University Faculty Member's Perspective: Lesson Learned From a Partnership Experience

by Killian Heil

Setting for a Partnership

The university partner is a private church owned institution with a student body of about 26,000. The public school partners are the five districts closest to Provo, the town in which the university is located. The five districts are Provo, Nebo, Alpine, Wasatch and Jordan.

Initiation of the Partnership Idea

Ralph Smith came to his job of dean of the college of education of Brigham Young University a few years prior to normal retirement age; so he is a leader in a hurry. He announced the beginning of the partnership between BYU and five neighboring school districts in April 1984. In the late fall 1984, the administration of the college, under the leadership of the associate dean, formed committees to study areas of concern within the BYU education programs. I was asked to head the committee on field expleriences, whose members were from every department plus the librarian in charge of the education collection. At our second meeting both the dean and university members agreed that field experiences involved both public schools and the university so public schools must be represented on our committee. That, in a sense, was the beginning of our involvement in the planning of the partnership.

Overview of Lessons Learned

A partnership is defined in the dictionary as the relationship between two or more competent persons who have contracted to share the profits. Two words, competent and share, focus on the central theme of lessons I have learned from a partnership experience. That central theme is trust which is firmly based on mutual respect(of each others competencies) among a university and five public school districts who believe they can benefit (share the profits) from working together as partners. Another way to state the theme is that mutual trust means the university and the five school districts attribute the best possible motives to each others words and actions in the mutual enterprise to improve the schools.

In the process of building trust, I learned that what are often termed little details are not little and that people who trust each other listen to each other. The negative side to this is what happens when there is no communication. Then fears are enlarged because of an accumulation of negative past experiences. Examples from the work of the field experience committee ---a mini partnership group---will show how the lessons were learned.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Building Trust With University Members

Building trust was accomplished by attention to so called little details and listening to each

other. The first little detail was setting a meeting time. I spent more time than I wanted to collecting schedules, talking to members, checking back and finally settling on a time. This process was an important detail because the personal contact let them know their presence was valued and their other time commitments were respected.

The second little detail was spelling names correctly. I discovered this when I found a member's name spelled two ways and asked him which was correct. He told me the correct spelling and described how he had once explained the cultural origin of the unusual spelling only to have his listener respond by telling him he was still wrong. Obviously his listener was not getting the message that a name symbolizes a valued heritage and the equally important fact that each person has a right to choose any spelling he or she wishes.

The third detail was recording attendance and absence at meetings. I had decided that members would come when they could so I would always record them as attending or excused rather than attending and absent. I was amused to have another chairperson read our minutes and say, "I don't excuse any of my members" in almost the same breath as he complained that he couldn't get enough members together to make decisions.

The fourth detail was making it easy to remember meetings by sending a timely reminder a day or so before the meeting. I also learned that changing the format of minutes could be a booby trap for speed readers. One member could have attended a meeting but did not come because he didn't realize the longer than usual minutes continued on the back of the page and that's where the time and place of the next meeting was listed. I learned what advertisers already know---get the important message on the first page.

At our first meetings we learned to listen to each other. We sounded as if we were muddling around on any topic that caught our fancy but we were really getting acquainted and building trust by listening to each other's frustrations and past experiences.

Building Trust with Public School Members

Starting in January 1985 and with encouragement from the college administration we asked for public school people to be added to our committee. Partnerships in the process of forming themselves aren't quite as fast as we wished but by April we held our first meeting with our new members. Again, I learned the importance of little details and of listening as part of the process of building trust.

Our first meeting was held on the BYU campus. The BYU members arrived at or before 3 pm and sat down in a circle facing each other, wondering if and when the new members would arrive. They came in ones and twos, each entering the door with an apologetic but exasperated comment about not being able to find a parking place and having to walk from lower campus or from off campus to get to the meeting room. Parking details were sending a variety of messages that might be as follows:

You're not part of the university so you can't park here.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There's no place for you---how can you be an equal partner if there's no place for you? You aren't doing an important job. You can leave earlier in order to have time to park far away and still be on time.

So the first item on the April minutes was one of the most important---either get parking permits or meet in the Continuing Education Building where visitor parking is amply available.

I started several times to explain the purpose of our committee and what we'd been discussing. Perhaps because of the interruptions as our disgruntled public school people straggled in, I couldn't tell if there was any involvement. Few comments came from our new members and it seemed to me that they were waiting and I didn't know for what. I don't remember what started the flow of responses about field experiences from their perspectives but the comments did begin and I soon had trouble writing fast enough to keep up as the meeting came alive. Another example of how important it is to listen in order to start building trust with our public school members.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Building Trust in the Governing Board.

At our summer meetings so many question were raised about our purpose and goals as a committee that the Associate Dean attended our meetings to answer those questions. He began to use us as a sounding board for ideas on partner schools. These would be schools under the auspices of the partnership and would serve as centers for preservice, inservice, curriculum development and research. He presented proposals to the Governing Board and then would speedily report back to us so we felt we were part of the partnership process. The Governing Board added to that feeling by offering us the responsibility of writing a proposal and application process for partner schools. The proposal was to be completed by February 1986.

Response of Public Schools Teachers and University Teacher to an Imposed Idea of Partnership

In the Fall of 1985 as we turned our attention towards writing the proposal for partnership schools, we became increasingly aware of the need to find out how public school and university teachers felt about the idea of working closer together. They had not been the creators of the partnership. The partnership decision had been made by their top administrators.

To find out how public school teachers felt about working with the university, a questionnaire was carried to the four closest districts in the partnership. The answers affirmed public school teachers belief in the importance of field experiences and their frustrations at the small amounts of money given to cooperating teachers and at college supervisors who do not listen, who do not communicate what student teachers should learn, and who do not spend enough time in the classroom.

To find out feelings about the newly announced partnership, informal questions were asked of

of both university and public school teachers. Both groups said the parnership was a good idea and would improve both schools and university programs for new teachers.

However, the public schools expressed fear of added time demands. Their day has never been long enough for all they are asked to accomplish. Elitism was feared with the choosing of partner schools. The fear was that the key school would be considered by both parents and district as the best school with the best teachers. I have already seen this in action as two teachers made disparaging remarks about a peer who is the principal of a school being considered as a partner school. The principal in question also reported that fellow principas now bristle at even ordinary suggestions he makes at principal meetings.

Change was feared. If a partner or key school is supposed to be open to change, what will prevent it from changing too often---or changing simply for changes sake. Who decides what research will be helpful to students?

Both the university and the public school were afraid of being taken over by each other. Public school people did not think universities paid enough attention to their expertise and vice-versa. Public school teachers have had bad experiences with university supervisors who tried to dictate their time schedules or advocate methods that flopped when tried. University teachers have watched student teachers struggle to learn to teach with a public school teacher who was a mediocre model. University faculty members were fearful of being dictated to by public school people, who in their opinion knew nothing about research and were likely to spend their time reinventing the wheel. Public school people have assented to research studies but never heard the results or known if there were any conclusions that could improve their teaching.

Both public school teachers and university faculties were fearful of dictatorial administrators ---even if they liked the idea being dictated. One public school teacher was convinced that his superintendent did not think teachers were important. University faculty reported concern because they didn't get reports on the progress of the partnership and would like to know what was happening.

Summary

The positive and the negative things I've learned ---building trust by way of important "little details" and listening to each other versus fears of additional time investment, elitism, change, partner takeover and administrative imposition are two sides of the same issue. Without trust, the fears grow. I find it rather scary that negative past experiences can have such a powerful effect on people's willingness to trust each other. I recognize that it operates in my own life. When I have repeatedly had someone fail to keep an agreement or live up to an expectation, I quit expecting that the person will do so, even if he or she declares an intent to change. I treat the person the same way as society has a reputation for treating the exconvict or ex drug addict.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The expectation is that most exconvicts will return to prison and most exdrug addicts will return to addiction. As I think about this problem, the thought occurs that the exconvict needs to be trusted to make changes in his life more than the solid citizen because he's experienced more failure. He trusts himself less. The person who is making a change trusts himself less too because change is hard and he or she may doubt his ability to act differently. The superintendent who is considered to be overly dictatorial, the teacher who has a reputation for being a poor teacher, all are in the ironic position of needing more trust if they sincerely desire to change, but getting less trust.

So in a partnership situation, the responsibility for developing trust on all levels rests as heavily on the other person as it does on the one who has made the decision to initiate changes in established ways of thinking and behaving. It requires the level of trust described in the introduction---attributing the best possible motives to those in the partnership. Public school teachers will have to help university supervisors who say they want to listen better; university faculty members will have to trust that a teacher who expresses the desire to work more closely sincerely wishes to do so. Teachers will have to trust that administrators who say they want to listen to teachers are going to do so. Mutual trust really means mutual work on overcoming the negative effects of past feelings---in other words, apending less time thinking and talking about past mistakes and more time on thinking and talking about what it takes to change and improve.

It is appropriate to the lessons I have learned about "little details" that my final comment should relate to the little detail of record keeping. As I planned this presentation I realized that without the record in the minutes I would not have recognized how speedy our progress as a commitee really was, how records unify the purpose of a group, how important it is to have an accurate record to refer to and that without a record I would neither have learned the importance of attention to small details, and of listening to each other nor recognized the devasting effect of dwelling on mistakes when a partnership is born and trust must be built. So I cast one more vote for the importance of details that let others know their ideas are valued because they are recorded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE PARTNERSHIP CONCEPT FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF AN EDUCATOR IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Joyce Nelson

As the erosion of quality education at all levels has taken place, public education has been expected to accept most of the responsibility for the decline in quality. Criticism has come from the public, from the business sector, and from government; and, in addition, higher education has made its own complaints against the public schools. Students' lack of preparation in basic skills and in the intellectual rigor that university work requires has been one of the major ones. Such criticism, even if justified, creates a defensive reaction in those who must bear the brunt of it. Educators at the public school level have particularly resented the charges made by their colleagues from higher education. After all, public school teachers are trained at universities, teach the way they were taught, and know that inadequacies exist at the university level; therefore, criticism from the university has been perceived as a betrayal and as an attempt to let public education serve as the scapegoat while university programs escape scrutiny.

For these, and other reasons, those involved in education have witnessed a polarization of the profession: educators at the various levels simply quit trying to communicate. University people have seemed to lack any kind of awareness of the changing character of schools and students: drugs, lack of interest in school, the breakdown of the family unit, the attitude that education is not very important to one's future--and certainly not to one's present situation--and a decline in respect for teachers. This has resulted in some hostility on the part of public educators who feel that professors simply do not live in the real world. With more demands upon public school teachers, there has

developed a growing feeling that the solutions, if there are any, are not going to come from the university and that school districts are going to have to tackle the problems on their own. As an example of this, inservice, at least in the districts that I know about, has begun to be the province of successful teachers inside the system--and these should certainly be involved in inservice--and consultants, usually with no university connections, who have formed private companies. These conditions have only widened the gap between "higher" and "lower" education, resulting, I believe, in an unwillingness to come together to identify common concerns, to explore possible solutions, to share resources, and, perhaps, most important of all, to build a bond, a sense that education is something very important and that all of us need to work together to strengthen it. In other words, the lack of communication within the profession has had a high cost attached to it.

Eventually, of course, the demands for educational reform have caused all segments of the profession to refocus their efforts; and in my experience the polarization between university and public education appears to be waning as a spirit of cooperation begins to return in order to find solutions for common problems. Among the cooperative efforts is the concept of a partnership between universities and public schools, a concept which is cause for tentative optimism, although it would be a mistake to assume more--or less--for it than has actually occurred: as always, the ideal is one thing; reality, another.

The university-school district partnership of my experience includes Brigham Young University and five adjoining school districts. My first assignment was to serve on the Teacher Preparation Task Force. The early meetings were not without frustration: we seemed to go over the same points each meeting; members of the task force were not always present; minutes did not accurately reflect the discussions that took place; it took time for the group to acknowledge that

the effort might really make a difference. Then, when the committee turned in the final report, we waited for results. What happened? Another committee was formed; this time a Field Program Committee on Teacher Education. Three of us were holdovers from the first committee, and we felt some desperation when it appeared that all we were doing in the new committee was to begin anew as if a year's effort had never taken place. However, bit by bit, a plan of action began to take shape; and, at this time, from the viewpoint of a public school teacher, the advantages, so far, in the partnership appear to be these:

(1) Both groups are talking to each other on a regular basis about joint concerns. It is true that committee effort is always characterized by the personalities of the committee members; however, there has been a marked spirit of candor, of mutual cooperation, and of good will. Public school people are asserting themselves with a degree of confidence and with less defensiveness about what they know, what they can do, and what they perceive needs to be changed; and university people are losing the sometime tendency to pronounce from Mount Sinai. I think it has been important to establish this kind of confidence in each other. Public school people feel valued, that someone is beginning to see them as competent and caring; and university people are becoming more involved with the actual issues of education.

(2) As the communication has improved, there has been a growing acceptance that both sides need each other to be truly effective. Theory and research, the realm of universities, need implementation in a wide sampling over an adequate period of time in order to be validated. It simply takes too long to get good practices into the public schools, partly, I think, because when they are presented by university personnel, there is such feeling that this person doesn't know how it really works in a real situation. It seems to be much more effective now to use public school people to tell other public school people

that something is working in the classroom and that "this" is how it works. The diversity of public education makes a true testing ground for research. At the same time, public educators, who have a tendency to overemphasize methods and strategies, are learning that without sound theory the methods sometimes deteriorate into gimmicks with no one really realizing why a strategy should be used and what impact the methods and strategies have on long-term learning; therefore, many valid practices are dropped before their effect is evident in the classroom.

(3) There is a growing awareness that both levels benefit if we are sharing resources. Improvement of education is not without cost: consultants, facilities, curriculum development, workshops for pre-service and inservice are all costly. It makes a lot of sense for universities and public school districts to pool resources. For example, if a need in education happens to be writing across the curriculum or in thinking skills, or whatever the area, it seems reasonable to assess what is needed at the university and in the schools and to plan together concerning what consultants to use, what format to offer--lecture, workshop, etc.--who should be involved, what follow-up should take place. That way the new ideas get into the schools sooner, public educators have a better sense of the preparation they must give their students, and the universities have actual classrooms where the ideas are being implemented to provide observation and practice for university students who are still at the pre-service stage.

In summary, the partnership is not a panacea for all that ails education. The real test will be if significant programs are developed that jointly serve the needs of the university and of the public schools with a true sense of partnership intact without all authority and decision-making powers ultiately shifting to the university so that traditional roles and attitudes become even more

entrenched. However, if universities and public schools are serious about improvement of education, the partnership is a most reasonable concept. If both groups really accept the idea that they need each other for each of them to be their most effective, valuable things can begin to happen. It prevents university people from becoming too isolated; it allows public school personnel to remain current and academically involved and to feel that there are rewards for professional growth. It places validity upon actual school experience, both in the classroom and at the administrative level. Of course, the end goal of the partnership is to create a better teaching and learning environment for everyone who is influenced by education.

Lessons learned from the partnership experience - A Superintendent's Perspective -Clark Cox

Partnerships between public schools and in higher education can be of significant benefit to both entities. Major pre-requisites for a successful partnership are equality of members, commitment at the highest level of university and district administration, and high level of involvement by personnel from all partnership members. Each participating entity must come to the partnership as an equal regardless of district or university enrollment or whether representing the university or a public school district. Each member school of the partnership is to be directly and continually involved in the program and have the commitment and direct representation of the dean of education or president of the university and superintendent of each school district. Teachers and administrators at both levels must be committed to and a part of the enterprise. Finally, a cooperatively financed budget must be developed to help indicate commitment and provide for the necessary expense of mailing, secretarial, and other needed services.

As a superintendent I have seen university professors and public school principals and teachers become highly motivated and involved in renewing their effort to improve college training programs and delivery programs to public school students. A number of university professors are spending a majority of their time in the field providing programs and gaining first hand information and experiencing the effect programs have on the public school members of the Partnership. Principals and public school teachers are on the university campus gaining a different perspective and enhancing their background in order to provide better educational programs. The cooperation and efforts of both these groups has paid dividends in changing and improving the training programs and cooperative educational efforts.

In addition, the indiscriminate flooding of public schools with master and doctoral degree research that has little potential value to the profession has been improved. Increased direction and checkpoints have been provided to help ensure the worth of the research and its potential effect on the students, the community, and the profession. A number of joint research efforts between the partnership and the university has yielded positive and worthwhile results. This coordination of efforts has increased the value and efficiency of these various research projects.

The working together in various task forces of a large number of principals, teachers, and professors has resulted in improved acceptance, mutual understanding, and working relationships. All audiences - boards of education, university administration, district administration, principals, counselors, teachers, labor leaders, and community - must be kept informed as to the nature of the partnership, its directions, successes, and failures.

To date the partnership has been positive and has shown promise in meeting the needs of the university and the public schools. The cooperation and accommodation of resources has been of benefit to the training programs and the students in the public schools.

PUBLIC SCHOOL - UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIP

Observations of a Dean

Ralph Smith

Colleges of education are at a point in time when important decisions must be made about the nature and extent of their relationships with the public schools. Presently, and for too many years, colleges of education have seen the public schools as little more than places for student teachers to practice newly learned skills. Beyond this association there is little which suggests an ongoing relationship in which the public schools have a role of any significance. For their part, the schools accept student teachers out of some sense of service to the profession, wanting to cooperate with colleges, and believing that they may be accorded some role in the preparation of teachers. But there has been no role for the schools and little in the way of participation in the affairs of the colleges which affect them. It is no longer appropriate that colleges continue an attitude of indifference which has characterized relations with the schools, nor can we continue to maintain the distance between us.

There should be little doubt that colleges of education need the public schools a good deal more than they need the colleges. We cannot continue to relegate the schools to a passive role in the relationships which exist. We need to assess present arrangements with schools and together become full and equal partners in the business of preparing educators and renewing schools. Colleges of education can no longer remain aloof, continuing to maintain that the problems of the schools are not

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

our concern. Their problems are our problems and colleges of education must assume some responsibility for what happens in the schools. We prepare the teachers, the principals, and counselors and our graduates take what we have taught them into the schools. We are part of the problem a fact which we must accept if we're to be part of the solution.

While the present movement for reform has focused on public education and what is wrong with the schools, we now hear calls for reform in teacher education. Presently, there are efforts to reform teacher education but one must wonder about the effectiveness of such reforms. The efforts of AACTE, the "redesign" standards of NCATE, the recommendations of the Holmes group, as well as the efforts of state departments will simply not be sufficient to effect the fundamental changes called for in teacher education. Such "calls" for reform will be little more than whimpers for they fail to address the basic issue of collaboration. Real reform will only occur when colleges of education and the public schools come together closing the gap which presently separates them and which precludes opportunities to address needed reforms in both institutions.

Gene Maeroff, education editor of the New York Times in a report to the Carnegie Foundation (1983) points out that "teacher preparation...should be the most important connection between the nation's colleges and schools." It is not. If we are to make it so colleges of education must involve the public schools in decisions which include the full range of issues and problems relating to teacher preparation - from admissions to programs, to

curriculum review, through the follow-up of graduates in their early years of teaching. We do not. Goodlad notes "the disaffection and sometimes outright hostility" of the schools toward colleges of education because we have failed to include Goodlad's call for collaboration, a "partnership" between colleges of education and the schools if we are to effectively "restructure schooling and the education of educators."

It should be noted that there are those who believe that a partnership between colleges of education and the schools to be essential and that such may be our "last chance."

The entry of Brigham Young University into a partnership with the public schools came easily. This due in part to the support of the University administration, the president and the vice presidents supporting a new role for the college in the public schools. The college deans and department chairmen supported the idea of the partnership as did members of the faculty - many of whom had come to the college following experiences in the public schools as teachers and principals. In addition, the frequent contacts between faculty and cooperating teachers which are necessary because of the size of our program - BYU is the largest teacher education institution in Utah, graduating over half of all teachers prepared in the state - also aided the new relationship. Further, there were those faculty members who were involved in research projects which took them into the schools. It was this support and contact which made our participation in the partnership come easily.

However easy our participation came, it was still a new

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

experience for both the dean and the superintendents. It was a new role for both, one quite different from that which the dean and superintendents were familiar. Both believed in the necessity of a closer working relationship and that time and attention would have to be given the partnership if it was to work. Thus, the college dean entered the partnership but not without some apprehension. It was a new venture, one for which there were few guidelines, directions or experience as to the operation of the kind of partnership contemplated - one which would have an affect on the public schools as well as the college.

Others here have noted that the college willingly accepted reviews of all its preparation programs by both college faculty and public school people. Together, we are examining preparation programs for elementary and secondary teachers, administrators, counselors, and special education teachers. There is collaboration in assessing foreign language offerings and new approaches to teaching mathematics in secondary schools, and in the support of programs for gifted and talented children (Ramses). Most recently, we have effected a liaison between research directors in the school districts and the director of the college research center.

Though such a picture is positive, there are problems which are bound to arise - and some have. The nature and purpose of the partnership must be carefully explained to both faculty and public school teachers. This, in order that faculty members understand the new relationship and accept the procedures of the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

organization. There have been instances of faculty seizing the opportunity to run and, independently of the school districts and college "do their own thing." There are those faculty with "an axe to grind" and who wish to pursue personal matters through the Partnership. Further, there must be a clear understanding and direction given those who wish to do things in the name of the partnership. As the partnership evolves we learn and we are beginning to see the evolution of a viable entity which provides service to the College and schools. The nature of the partnership is such that increasing numbers of college and public school people will be coming together to accomplish common goals. Though some public school people remain suspicious of our motives, and "old wounds" have surfaced, progress is being made, even after two years of collaboration, public school people on some of the task forces are waiting to see if the college is serious about giving them a role in the preparation of educators. We has no idea of the distance which separated us from the public schools. But one must not expect miracles overnight, for healing takes time and trust and acceptance come slowly. This is probably the first time that the college has indicated a willingness to collaborate openly, and to accept public school people as full partners in the business of education. But change will come, not only in the relationships between college and public school people, but in the college and the schools as well.

Finally, there is the matter of commitment. The partnership is not a sometime arrangement, with colleges and public schools coming together on those occasions that suit the needs of one or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

another. The school-university partnership talked about here will require a long-term commitment on the part of both groups - a commitment to the notion, of personnel and financial resources, of time, attention, and spirit. Without such a commitment, the partnership will not work.

The schools and the college have matters of their own which each must attend to, the partnership requires the attention of both. We need each other if the partnership is to be effective, for the nature of the problems facing us requires collaboration. We are long past the time when anything of significance can be accomplished independently of each other. We can do better together than either can do alone.

Are there alternatives? Perhaps. We can continue the present arrangement between the schools and the colleges. Though this is not a happy arrangement it is convenient to the college. The schools are restive and one must wonder how long such an arrangement will continue. A second alternative is that some other organization - such as that proposed by Philip Schlecty at the University of Louisville - which will involve a union of schools, professional organizations and the university to do what we are not doing well at present. A final alternative is to get out of the business of preparing teachers. We have not persuasively convinced the schools or the public of any meaningful contribution to education, we seem unable to make a case for teacher education, to persuade others that we have a meaningful contribution to make.

We may be facing our "last hurrah", looking at a "last

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

chance" to demonstrate the necessity and importance of what we do, that our contributions to education make a difference. But it will have to be done soon. Our one best chance to do what must be done can only be accomplished through a full partnership with the public schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE